NYU-TH-10/12/2016

Dark Energy and Inflation with Volume Normalized Action

Gregory Gabadadze and Siqing Yu

Center for Cosmology and Particle Physics, Department of Physics, New York University, New York, NY, 10003, USA

arXiv:1611.05833v1 [hep-th] 17 Nov 2016

Abstract

In the theories described by a volume normalized action functional, an arbitrary cosmological constant is eliminated from the physical picture of our Universe, and dynamical alternatives must be responsible for today's accelerated expansion as well as for the conjectured early-time inflation in the Universe. A few well-known such scenarios realized by a single homogeneous scalar field are examined in this new context, and their diverse fates are elucidated. Typical inflationary models are not affected at the level of the background evolution, and also give rise to the scalar perturbations equivalent to those obtained in the standard General Relativity; however, the primordial quantum tensor fluctuations are absent in the new framework, irrespective of the inflationary model. As a consequence, our proposal would be ruled out should the primordial tensor modes, or their indirect consequences, be discovered in observations.

1 Introduction

Based on the ideas in [1, 2], a class of theories that eliminate an arbitrary cosmological constant (CC) from our Universe has been proposed recently [3, 4]. It has been suggested that the 4D physical metric of our Universe, $g_{\mu\nu}$, lives on the conformal boundary of a 5D anti-de Sitter (AdS_5) space, which is endowed with its own 5D metric F_{AB}. The theories are described by the action functionals of the form

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{V_F}{V_g} S + S_F, \tag{1.1}$$

where V_F and V_g are the respective invariant volumes of the 5D and 4D spacetimes, S_F is the bulk Einstein-Hilbert action with a large negative CC, and S is the action of our world, containing g-gravity and matter fields. (1.1) has the property that any CC generated in the 4D g-universe by any source is immaterial for the g-universe. Instead, that CC gets absorbed into S_F; it adds to, or subtracts from, the curvature of AdS_5. The particle physics quantum effects can be kept intact, while the gravity loops of g are suppressed by the effective Planck constant, $\hbar V_g/V_F$. The ratio of the volumes is determined by the classical solutions such that $\hbar V_g/V_F \to 0$. Then the gravity loops do not generate any counterterms to the action for the metric g, and at low energies, gravity in our Universe becomes a purely classical theory that couples to quantized particle physics [3, 4]. A high price for this resolution of the CC problem is an intrinsic spacetime nonlocality, which however is only sensed by CC, but not any other form of energy/matter [3, 4]. The effective action that describes classical evolution of our Universe is then the one introduced by Tseytlin [2]

$$\bar{S} = \frac{S}{V_g}, \tag{1.2}$$

which we call the "volume normalized" action, a term inspired by the work [5].[1]

This CC-free framework then necessitates a dynamical dark energy component that drives the accelerated expansion today. In this regard, [6] utilizes massive gravity [7, 8], which is ghost-free [9–12] and has a technically natural graviton mass [13]; it also presents a new class of healthy self-accelerated background solutions in the decoupling limit. With the help of nonlocal Galileon terms [14], these solutions exhibit no linear scalar-tensor mixing [15] and thus no van Dam-Veltman-Zakharov (vDVZ) discontinuity [16, 17]. However, just as any other solution obtained via the decouplimg limit, their full-theory consistency beyond that limit remains unsettled. Reviews of massive gravity can be found in [18–20].

Here we study instead some "more traditional" dark energy candidates in the new framework. We limit ourselves to the following possibilities described by the rolling of a single homogeneous scalar field: (a) minimally coupled to gravity, commonly known as "quintessence" [21, 22], (b) non-minimally coupled to gravity [23, 24], and (c) Chaplygin gas [25]. Furthermore, many of the single scalar field scenarios with a slow-roll regime were first used to describe inflation [26–28], for which the results of this paper apply equally well, once the

[1] While our action (1.1) differs from that used by Davidson and Rubin, there is significant conceptual overlap with the work [5].

energy scales involved are adjusted accordingly.[2] Conveniently, we will treat the dark energy and the inflationary scenarios driven by the same mechanism alike, commenting on them separately when appropriate. It turns out that (a) and (b) are unscathed when incorporated into (1.2), whereas (c) loses its original features. The details are given in sections 2, 3, and 4, respectively. We conclude in section 5 with general obvervations and discussions on fluctuations, highlighting the testable prediction of a zero tensor-scalar ratio in the primordial power spectra. Reviews can be found in [29–31] for dark energy and [32–36] for inflation.

To discuss cosmology, we use a homogeneous scalar profile, $\phi(\vec{x},t) = \phi(t)$, on a flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) background metric in the mostly positive signature, $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j$. Time derivatives are denoted by dots. To make nonlocal expressions unambiguous, a ratio between spacetime integrals is defined as follows: first compute the ratio of integrals in a finite spacetime volume, then take the limit when the region of integration tend to infinity in all dimensions.

2 Minimally Coupled Scalar

In the framework of (1.2), the theory of a scalar field minimally coupled to gravity is described by the variation of

$$\bar{S} = \frac{S}{V_g} = \frac{\int d^4x\,\sqrt{-g}\left[\frac{M_{\rm P}^2}{2}R - \frac{1}{2}g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi - V(\phi)\right]}{\int d^4x\,\sqrt{-g}}. \tag{2.1}$$

This modifies the Einstein's equations to

$$M_{\rm P}^2 G_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu} - \bar{S}g_{\mu\nu}, \tag{2.2}$$

with

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi - g_{\mu\nu}\left[\frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha\phi\partial_\beta\phi + V(\phi)\right]. \tag{2.3}$$

The Friedmann equations become

$$3M_{\rm P}^2 H^2 = \rho_\phi + \bar{S}, \tag{2.4}$$

$$3M_{\rm P}^2(\dot{H} + H^2) = -\frac{\rho_\phi + 3p_\phi}{2} + \bar{S}, \tag{2.5}$$

with the definitions

$$\rho_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi), \quad p_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi), \quad H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}, \quad w_\phi = \frac{p_\phi}{\rho_\phi}. \tag{2.6}$$

The ϕ equation of motion is still

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V'(\phi) = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

[2]Throughout the paper, we consider only the scenarios in which our 4D Universe evolves in a single vacuum state. We do not attempt, for instance, to generalize (1.2) to adopt chaotic inflation with multiple vacua.

Compared to the familiar theory described by just S, there are now new terms $\propto \bar{S}$ in the Friedmann equations. However, using (2.4) and (2.5),

$$\bar{S} = \frac{\int d^3x dt\ a^3 \left[3M_{\rm P}^2(\dot{H}+2H^2)+p\right]}{\int d^3x dt\ a^3} = \frac{\int d^3x dt\ a^3 \left[2\bar{S}+\frac{\rho_\phi - p_\phi}{2}\right]}{\int d^3x dt\ a^3}, \tag{2.8}$$

so

$$\bar{S} = -\frac{\int dt\ a^3 V(\phi(t))}{\int dt\ a^3} = -\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{\int_{t_i}^T dt\ a^3 \left[V(\phi(t)) - V_{\rm min}\right]}{\int_{t_i}^T dt\ a^3} - V_{\rm min}, \tag{2.9}$$

where t_i is the time when ϕ becomes dynamical and $V_{\rm min}$ is the global minimum of the potential $V(\phi)$ that ϕ rolls towards. We write $\bar{S}$ as such so that the integrand of the numerator in (2.9) is zero at $t = T$.

It is not hard to see that the first term in $\bar{S}$ written this way vanishes on reasonable potentials and rolling ϕ profiles that satisfy the minimal requirements of smoothness, increasing scaling factor and decaying energy density. Explicitly, note that $\int dt\ a^3 V(\phi)$ is bounded by $\int dt\ a^3 \rho_\phi$ from above; let us consider the quantity

$$I_1 = \frac{\int_{t_i}^T dt\ a^3 \rho_\phi}{\int_{t_i}^T dt\ a^3}. \tag{2.10}$$

As $a(t)$ increases with time, we only need to check the late-time behavior of ρ_ϕ. In a typical quintessence/inflation scenario, we have $V_{\rm min} = 0$ and $\rho_\phi \propto a^{-n}$ with $n(t) = \frac{3}{1+w_\phi(t)} > 0$ throughout the evolution. Thus, in the $T \to \infty$ limit, $I_1 \to 0$. This establishes $\bar{S} = 0$, implying that any such scenario remains untouched in the volume normalized framework. One can also freely include ordinary matter ($\rho \propto a^{-3}$) or radiation ($\rho \propto a^{-4}$) in the scenario, because they do not contribute to $\bar{S}$, by the same argument.

Note that a constant shift of $V(\phi)$ does not change the Friedmann equations. A straightforward generalization of the analysis above shows that it is only the "non-constant" part of ρ_ϕ, $V - V_{\rm min}$, that drives cosmic expansion. While this follows intuitively from the CC-freedom of the volume normalized action, it can be seen nontrivially in (2.9); because $V(\phi(T)) - V_{\rm min} = 0$ by definition and the integrals are dominated by late-time contributions, the first term of (2.9) vanishes for any sensible $V(\phi)$ and ϕ profiles, and the sole effect of $\bar{S}$ is to neutralize a CC.

As an example, consider the ultralight pseudo-Nambu-Goldstone boson (PNGB) model for dark energy [37], in which the PNGB scalar field has the effective potential

$$V(\phi) = M^4 \left[1 - \cos\left(\frac{\phi}{f}\right)\right]. \tag{2.11}$$

The structure of this potential is protected by the fermionic chiral symmetries, so the smallness of $m_\phi \sim \frac{M^2}{f} \sim 10^{-29} - 10^{-34}$ eV is natural from the particle physics point of view ($M \sim$ light neutrino mass $\sim 10^{-2} - 10^{-3}$ eV, $f \sim$ global symmetry breaking scale $\sim 10^{16} - 10^{19}$ GeV). At early times, $\rho_\phi \simeq -p_\phi \sim M^4$ mimics a CC; at late times, $\rho_\phi \sim a^{-3}$ looks like ordinary matter [37]. This clearly guarantees $\bar{S} = 0$, and thus represents a viable and theoretically favorable dark energy scenario in the volume normalized framework. The

same can be said about the natural inflation model, where the QCD axion PNGB has the same potential (2.11), except that it probes the GUT scale, $M \sim 10^{16}$ GeV and $f \gtrsim 10^{19}$ GeV [38].

As an aside, we also briefly look at a minimally coupled phantom scalar [39], which has the wrong sign kinetic term. For a homogeneous phantom scalar on flat FRW background, $\rho_\phi = -\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi)$, $p_\phi = -\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi)$, $w_\phi < -1$, and at late times, $\rho_\phi \propto a^n$ with $n > 0$. The same argument above gives

$$-\bar{S} = \frac{\int dt\ a^3 V(\phi(t))}{\int dt\ a^3} > \frac{\int dt\ a^3 \rho_\phi}{\int dt\ a^3} = \infty, \tag{2.12}$$

if one uses a ϕ profile that leads to cosmic expansion. This clearly makes no sense in view of (2.4), so phantom energy is ruled out in the volume normalized framework.

3 Non-minimally Coupled Scalar

A scalar field non-minimally coupled to gravity is described in the volume normalized framework by

$$\bar{S} = \frac{S}{V_g} = \frac{\int d^4x\ \sqrt{-g}\left[\frac{M_{\rm P}^2 + f(\phi)}{2} R - \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi - V(\phi)\right]}{\int d^4x\ \sqrt{-g}}, \tag{3.1}$$

for which the Einstein's equations become

$$\left[M_{\rm P}^2 + f(\phi)\right] G_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu} - \bar{S} g_{\mu\nu} + \left(\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}\Box\right) f(\phi), \tag{3.2}$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}$ is still defined as in (2.3) for ease of comparison. We continue to write the Friedmann equations in the form of (2.4) and (2.5), but now with

$$\rho_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi) - 3H f'(\phi)\dot{\phi}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$p_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi) + 2H f'(\phi)\dot{\phi} + f'(\phi)\ddot{\phi} + f''(\phi)\dot{\phi}^2, \tag{3.4}$$

and the ϕ equation is

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V'(\phi) - 3(\dot{H} + 2H^2) f'(\phi) = 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Plugging the Friedmann equations back into (3.1),

$$\bar{S} = \frac{1}{\int dt\ a^3}\int dt\ a^3 \left\{-V(\phi) + \frac{3}{2}\left[3H f'(\phi)\dot{\phi} + f'(\phi)\ddot{\phi} + f''(\phi)\dot{\phi}^2\right]\right\} \tag{3.6}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\int dt\ a^3}\int dt\ a^3 \left\{\rho_\phi - \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - \frac{3}{2}\left[H f'(\phi)\dot{\phi} + f'(\phi)\ddot{\phi} + f''(\phi)\dot{\phi}^2\right]\right\}. \tag{3.7}$$

Compared to (2.9), the new terms in the integrand of (3.6) are all proportional to the time derivatives of ϕ, which vanish at the end of the cosmic evolution. Then we have $\bar{S} = -V_{\rm min}$ by the same argument in the last section for reasonable potentials and ϕ profiles. Also, note

that by (3.7), for ρ_ϕ proportional to the negative powers of $a(t)$, which necessarily means $V_{\min} = 0$, $\bar{S} = 0$ identically. Therefore, the classical pictures of cosmic expansion in the non-minimally coupled models are exactly the same in the frameworks of S and $\bar{S}$.

This result applies generically to a wide range of non-minimally coupled dark energy [23, 24, 40–44] and inflation models [45–51]. Notably, the Higgs inflation model [52, 53] uses the radial mode of the Higgs field as the non-minimally coupled scalar and needs no extra field beyond the Standard Model (SM). There the equations of motion receive extra contributions from the coupling between Higgs and other SM fields, but these local effects clearly do not affect the argument above.

So far we have worked in the Jordan frame. In the non-minimally coupled scalar setup, it is also popular to transform to the Einstein frame, in which we will demonstrate the result above with the choice [48–53]

$$f(\phi) = \xi\phi^2, \quad V(\phi) = \frac{\lambda}{4}\left(\phi^2 - v^2\right)^2. \tag{3.8}$$

Following [52, 53], the field redefinitions read

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \Omega^{-2}\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}, \quad \Omega^2 = 1 + \frac{\xi\phi^2}{M_{\rm P}^2}, \qquad \frac{d\chi}{d\phi} = \sqrt{\frac{\Omega^2 + \frac{6\xi^2\phi^2}{M_{\rm P}^2}}{\Omega^4}}, \tag{3.9}$$

under which (3.1) becomes

$$\bar{S} = \frac{\int d^4x\ \sqrt{-\hat{g}}\left[\frac{M_{\rm P}^2}{2}\hat{R} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{g}^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\chi\partial_\nu\chi - U(\chi)\right]}{\int d^4x\ \Omega^{-4}(\chi)\sqrt{-\hat{g}}}, \tag{3.10}$$

where $\hat{R}$ is calculated from $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}$, and

$$U(\chi) = \Omega^{-4}(\chi)\frac{\lambda}{4}\left(\phi^2(\chi) - v^2\right)^2. \tag{3.11}$$

On rolling solutions that lead to cosmic expansion, the field values are large at early times and small at the end of the evolution, so Ω^{-4} gradually increases to 1. Then the situation is essentially reduced to that of a minimally coupled scalar χ with $U_{\min} = 0$, because the integrals in (3.10) are clearly dominated by late-time contributions. Repeating the analysis in the last section step by step then yields $\bar{S} = 0$, as expected.

4 Chaplygin Gas

Chaplygin gas is an exotic cosmic fluid that has the equation of state $p = -\frac{A}{\rho}$. In a flat FRW universe, energy conservation implies that

$$\rho = \sqrt{A + \frac{B}{a^6}}, \tag{4.1}$$

which represents a unified dark energy/matter fluid that transitions from a CC to a "stiff matter" with $\rho \sim a^{-6}$ [25]. Microscopically, it has been shown that the Chaplygin gas

equation of state can be induced by a 3-brane living in a 5D Minkowski space on the 4D braneworld transverse to its lightcone [54–58]; it remains to be checked if this picture can be made compatible with (1.1). Anyway, we present the Chaplygin gas scenario as a negative example.

The profile (4.1) can be realized by a scalar field minimally coupled to gravity with the potential

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\sqrt{A}}{2}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}\phi}{M_{\rm P}}\right) + \frac{1}{\cosh\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}\phi}{M_{\rm P}}\right)}\right]. \tag{4.2}$$

However, in the volume normalized framework, the analysis in section 2 shows that $V_{\rm min} = \sqrt{A}$ does not contribute to the Friedmann equations. The effective potential in this case is

$$V_{\rm eff} = V(\phi) - V_{\rm min} = \frac{\sqrt{A}}{2}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}\phi}{M_{\rm P}}\right) + \frac{1}{\cosh\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}\phi}{M_{\rm P}}\right)} - 2\right], \tag{4.3}$$

so the Chaplygin gas solution is no longer valid. In fact,

$$V_{\rm eff} \propto \frac{\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}\phi}{M_{\rm P}}\right) - 1\right]^2}{\cosh\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}\phi}{M_{\rm P}}\right)}, \tag{4.4}$$

which describes just another quintessence scenario interpolating between known models, $V(\phi) \propto \left[\cosh\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}\phi}{M_{\rm P}}\right) - 1\right]^q$ with $q = 1, 2$ [59]. The same argument here also applies to generalized Chaplygin gas models [60], simply because the extra terms in the Friedmann equations nullify any CC-like component.

5 Conclusion

The discussion so far allows us to see some general facts about the dynamical dark energy/inflation models in the framework of the volume normalized action. The variational principle of (1.2) yields

$$\delta\bar{S} = \delta\left(\frac{S}{V_g}\right) = \frac{1}{V_g}\left(\delta S - \frac{S}{V_g}\delta V_g\right), \tag{5.1}$$

so all non-gravitational local physics encoded in S is left unchanged, while the Einstein's equations are modified by the extra term $\propto \bar{S}$. The latter is then the key to understand the differences between the theories described by S and $\bar{S}$. In both dark energy and inflationary scenarios, the scale factor $a(t)$ increases with time and becomes very large at the end of the evolution, so S is dominated by the late-time behavior of its integrand, which implies that, $\bar{S} = -V_{\rm min}$. Without a surprise, this is just a roundabout way to see that the volume normalized action automatically gets rid of any CC-like contribution to the cosmic equation of state.

As for the scalar fluctuations $\delta\phi(\vec{x}, t)$, they are merely local effects and thus do not contribute to $\bar{S}$. The same can be said about the metric fluctuations $\delta g_{\mu\nu}(\vec{x}, t)$. Also,

finite temperature has no effect on $\bar{S}$, which depends only on the late-time picture of the Universe that approaches a zero temperature state. Thus, the dynamics of field fluctuations do not differ from that obtained via S, except that $\delta g_{\mu\nu}(\vec{x}, t)$ are only classical, owing to the vanishing effective Planck constant for gravity loops, as mentioned in section 1.

Because the inflaton is still quantized with $\hbar$, the inflationary predictions for primordial scalar modes do not change in the new framework. This can be seen in two ways. First: even though the scalar perturbation is a mixture of the inflaton and the metric fluctuation, it is possible to choose a gauge in which the scalar modes are due entirely to the inflaton fluctuations. Second: one needs not choose a gauge, but rather organize the scalar perturbations into gauge invariant quantities, which are to be diagonalized and canonically normalized before quantization. For example, during the de Sitter stage of a minimally coupled model, the quadratic action for scalar perturbations can be reduced to [32–36]

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{2}\int d^3x d\eta \left[(u')^2 - (\partial_i u)^2 + \frac{z''}{z}u^2\right], \tag{5.2}$$

where η is the conformal time and primes are derivatives with respect to it. The gauge invariant quantities are

$$u = z\mathcal{R}, \quad \mathcal{R} = \left(\Psi + \frac{H}{\dot{\phi}}\delta\phi\right), \quad z^2 = \frac{a^2\dot{\phi}^2}{H^2}, \tag{5.3}$$

where $\mathcal{R}$ is known as the comoving curvature perturbation, and Ψ is defined in the way that the scalar and tensor metric fluctuations are expressed as

$$ds^2 = -(1+2\Phi)dt^2 + 2a\partial_i B dx^i dt + a^2\left[(1-2\Psi)\delta_{ij} + 2\partial_i\partial_j E + h_{ij}\right]dx^i dx^j. \tag{5.4}$$

One can then go to a gauge with $\Psi = 0$, so that u is due to $\delta\phi$ only. One can also directly quantize u from (5.2), without fixing Ψ or $\delta\phi$. In the latter case, the quantized scalar modes are completely equivalent regardless of whether the scalar metric fluctuations are fundamentally classical or quantum, thus leading to the same predicted power spectra.

In fact, the usual procedure of diagonalizing and quantizing the scalar perturbations might bring a confusion in the new framework. We use a toy model to illustrate this subtlety. Consider the following theory of two coupled scalar fields in a Minkowski space,

$$S_{\text{toy}} = \int d^4x \left[-\frac{1}{2}(\partial\sigma)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial\tau)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m^2(\sigma^2+\tau^2) - b^2\sigma\tau\right], \tag{5.5}$$

where $b^2 \leq m^2$ is a coupling constant. We demand that σ is a quantum field but τ is a classical field, being analogs of the inflaton and metric perturbations, respectively. The fields have commutators

$$[\sigma(\vec{x}, t), \dot{\sigma}(\vec{y}, t)] = i\hbar\delta(\vec{x}-\vec{y}), \quad [\tau(\vec{x}, t), \dot{\tau}(\vec{y}, t)] = 0, \tag{5.6}$$

and all others are zero. To diagonalize the action, we define

$$\Lambda = \sigma + \tau, \quad \Theta = \sigma - \tau, \tag{5.7}$$

upon which

$$S_{\rm toy} = \int d^4x \left[-\frac{1}{4}(\partial\Lambda)^2 - \frac{1}{4}(\partial\Theta)^2 - \frac{1}{4}(m^2+b^2)\Lambda^2 - \frac{1}{4}(m^2-b^2)\Theta^2 \right]. \tag{5.8}$$

Naively, if we were to quantize both Λ and Θ, it would appears that we are getting two quantum fields out of one quantized field and one classical field, which cannot be consistent. However, (5.6) implies that there are now nontrivial cross terms among the new commutators,

$$[\Lambda(\vec{x},t), \dot{\Theta}(\vec{y},t)] = [\Theta(\vec{x},t), \dot{\Lambda}(\vec{y},t)] = i\hbar\delta(\vec{x}-\vec{y}). \tag{5.9}$$

Therefore, Λ and Θ are not independent quantum degrees of freedom, in the sense that a specific combination of them is classical, in this case $\tau = \frac{\Lambda-\Theta}{2}$. Then the "undiagonalized" form (5.5) is actually more suitable for the computation of quantum correlation functions in the standard language of quantum field theory, with τ treated as a classical source. In the context of inflationary scalar perturbations above, this means that we need not obtain the diagonalized form (5.2), but just compute the correlation functions of $\delta\phi$ in any gauge to get the power spectra.

On the other hand, the tensor metric fluctuations h_{ij} in (5.4), which satisfy the transverse traceless condition $\partial^i h_{ij} = h^i_i = 0$, and evolve separately, are not quantized in the volume normalized framework, thus giving vanishing quantum correlation functions and power spectrum. This implies that no primordial tensor modes arise during inflation – that is, the theory predicts a zero tensor-scalar ratio, $r = 0$, irrespective of the inflationary model. Thus, the framework (1.1) with $\hbar V_g/V_F \to 0$ could be falsified by observational data that would deny this null prediction, e.g., by the detection of the primordial gravitational waves.

Acknowledgements

We thank Justin Khoury and Archil Kobakhidze for useful discussions. Both GG and SY are supported by NASA grant NNX12AF86G S06 and NSF grant PHY-1316452. SY is also supported by the NYU James Arthur graduate fellowship. GG acknowledges a membership at the NYU-ECNU Joint Physics Research Institute in Shanghai.

References

[1] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **200**, 272 (1988).

[2] A. A. Tseytlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 545 (1991).

[3] G. Gabadadze, Phys. Lett. B **739**, 263 (2014) [arXiv:1406.6701 [hep-th]].

[4] G. Gabadadze and S. Yu, arXiv:1510.07943 [hep-th].

[5] A. Davidson and S. Rubin, Class. Quant. Grav. **26**, 235019 (2009) [arXiv:0905.0661 [gr-qc]].

[6] G. Gabadadze and S. Yu, arXiv:1608.01060 [hep-th].

[7] C. de Rham and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 044020 (2010) [arXiv:1007.0443 [hep-th]];

[8] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 231101 (2011) [arXiv:1011.1232 [hep-th]].

[9] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 041101 (2012) [arXiv:1106.3344 [hep-th]]; S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **1204**, 123 (2012) [arXiv:1111.2070 [hep-th]].

[10] M. Mirbabayi, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 084006 (2012) [arXiv:1112.1435 [hep-th]].

[11] C. Deffayet, J. Mourad and G. Zahariade, JCAP **1301**, 032 (2013) [arXiv:1207.6338 [hep-th]]; C. Deffayet, J. Mourad and G. Zahariade, JHEP **1303**, 086 (2013) [arXiv:1208.4493 [gr-qc]].

[12] T. Kugo and N. Ohta, PTEP **2014**, 043B04 (2014) [arXiv:1401.3873 [hep-th]].

[13] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, L. Heisenberg and D. Pirtskhalava, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 8, 085017 (2013) [arXiv:1212.4128].

[14] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and E. Trincherini, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 064036 (2009) [arXiv:0811.2197 [hep-th]].

[15] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, L. Heisenberg and D. Pirtskhalava, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 103516 (2011) [arXiv:1010.1780 [hep-th]].

[16] H. van Dam and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **22**, 397 (1970).

[17] V. I. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **12**, 312 (1970) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **12**, 447 (1970)].

[18] K. Hinterbichler, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 671 (2012) [arXiv:1105.3735 [hep-th]].

[19] C. de Rham, Living Rev. Rel. **17**, 7 (2014) [arXiv:1401.4173 [hep-th]].

[20] A. S. Goldhaber and M. M. Nieto, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 939 (2010) [arXiv:0809.1003 [hep-ph]].

[21] R. R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1582 (1998) [astro-ph/9708069].

[22] I. Zlatev, L. M. Wang and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 896 (1999) [astro-ph/9807002].

[23] L. Amendola, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 043501 (1999) [astro-ph/9904120]; L. Amendola, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 043511 (2000) [astro-ph/9908023].

[24] F. Perrotta, C. Baccigalupi and S. Matarrese, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 023507 (1999) [astro-ph/9906066].

[25] A. Y. Kamenshchik, U. Moschella and V. Pasquier, Phys. Lett. B **511**, 265 (2001) [gr-qc/0103004].

[26] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 347 (1981).

[27] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **108B**, 389 (1982).

[28] A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1220 (1982).

[29] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 559 (2003) [astro-ph/0207347].

[30] S. Tsujikawa, arXiv:1004.1493 [astro-ph.CO].

[31] M. Li, X. D. Li, S. Wang and Y. Wang, Commun. Theor. Phys. **56**, 525 (2011) [arXiv:1103.5870 [astro-ph.CO]].

[32] A. Riotto, hep-ph/0210162.

[33] V. Mukhanov, "Physical foundations of cosmology," Cambridge University Press, UK, 2005, $421p$.

[34] B. A. Bassett, S. Tsujikawa and D. Wands, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 537 (2006) [astro-ph/0507632].

[35] W. H. Kinney, arXiv:0902.1529 [astro-ph.CO].

[36] D. Baumann, arXiv:0907.5424 [hep-th].

[37] J. A. Frieman, C. T. Hill, A. Stebbins and I. Waga, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2077 (1995) [astro-ph/9505060].

[38] K. Freese, J. A. Frieman and A. V. Olinto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3233 (1990).

[39] R. R. Caldwell, Phys. Lett. B **545**, 23 (2002) [astro-ph/9908168].

[40] J. P. Uzan, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 123510 (1999) [gr-qc/9903004].

[41] T. Chiba, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 083508 (1999) [gr-qc/9903094].

[42] N. Bartolo and M. Pietroni, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 023518 (2000) [hep-ph/9908521].

[43] C. Baccigalupi, S. Matarrese and F. Perrotta, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 123510 (2000) [astro-ph/0005543].

[44] A. Riazuelo and J. P. Uzan, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 023525 (2002) [astro-ph/0107386].

[45] B. L. Spokoiny, Phys. Lett. **147B**, 39 (1984).

[46] T. Futamase and K. i. Maeda, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 399 (1989).

[47] L. Amendola, M. Litterio and F. Occhionero, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **5**, 3861 (1990).

[48] D. S. Salopek, J. R. Bond and J. M. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 1753 (1989).

[49] R. Fakir and W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 1783 (1990).

[50] D. I. Kaiser, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 4295 (1995) [astro-ph/9408044].

[51] E. Komatsu and T. Futamase, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 064029 (1999) [astro-ph/9901127].

[52] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **659**, 703 (2008) [arXiv:0710.3755 [hep-th]].

[53] F. Bezrukov, A. Magnin, M. Shaposhnikov and S. Sibiryakov, JHEP **1101**, 016 (2011) [arXiv:1008.5157 [hep-ph]].

[54] M. Bordemann and J. Hoppe, Phys. Lett. B **317**, 315 (1993) [hep-th/9307036].

[55] J. Hoppe, Phys. Lett. B **329**, 10 (1994) [hep-th/9402112].

[56] D. Bazeia and R. Jackiw, Annals Phys. **270**, 246 (1998) [hep-th/9803165].

[57] D. Bazeia, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 085007 (1999) [hep-th/9811150].

[58] R. Jackiw and A. P. Polychronakos, Commun. Math. Phys. **207**, 107 (1999) [hep-th/9902024].

[59] V. Sahni and L. M. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 103517 (2000) [astro-ph/9910097].

[60] M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami and A. A. Sen, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 043507 (2002) [gr-qc/0202064].